

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

United States of America,

Plaintiff,

v.

Jenna Leanne Alec,
Kalera mile Kam,
Kenneth Lee Kemp Jonathan Salazar,
and Daniel Taylor Taufi,
Defendants.

Case No. CR 16-516 HSG - 4, 5, 6, 7, 8

STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING
TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT

FILED

MAY - 8 2017

SUSAN Y. SOONG
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND

For the reason stated by the parties on the record on May 8, 2017, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from May 8, 2017, to June 12, 2017 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factors:

- _____ Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).
- _____ The case is so unusual or so complex, due to *[circle applicable reasons]* the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
- _____ Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
- _____ Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
- ✓ _____ Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
- _____ For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(E)/(F) for delay resulting from removal/transport of the defendant to another district.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 8, 2017

STIPULATED:

Attorneys for Defendants

HON. NANDOR J. VADAS
United States Magistrate Judge

Brigid S. Martin
Assistant United States Attorney